

**RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
City Clerk's Conference Room, 1st Floor, City Hall  
400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada  
CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTERNET ADDRESS: <http://www.ci.las-vegas.nv.us>

**December 21, 2001**  
**1:30 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER: City Clerk Ronemus called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Barbara Jo (Roni) Ronemus, City Clerk  
Doug Selby, Deputy City Manager  
John Redlein, Assistant City Attorney  
Joseph Marcella, Director, Information Technologies  
Richard Goecke, Director, Public Works  
David Riggleman, Director, Public Information Office (Arrived at 1:40 p.m.  
and excused at 2:02 p.m.)  
Sharon Kuhns, Records Administrator  
Doreen Araujo, Deputy City Clerk I

EXCUSED: Mark Vincent, Director, Finance & Business Services  
Radford Snelding, City Auditor

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE RE COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING LAW - Meeting  
noticed and posted at the following locations:

Downtown Transportation Center, City Clerk's Board  
Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road  
Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy  
Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall  
City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(1:35)  
**1-1**

BUSINESS:

A. APPROVAL OF FINAL MINUTES BY REFERENCE OF THE RECORDS  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 9, 2001.

**GOECKE - Motion to APPROVE – SELBY seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS with  
VINCENT and SNELDING excused**

(1:35)  
**1-24**

**B. ABEYANCE ITEM – DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING DEFINITIONS AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS IN THE MUNICIPAL RECORDS MANUAL.**

Chair Ronemus indicated that in Chapter 2 of the Municipal Records Manual the date of November 29, 2000 approving the Public Records Access Policy should be revised to whatever date the action is taken.

Under “Definitions” Chair Ronemus expressed concern about the first paragraph of the word “received” because it is too broad. There are few things that she receives that she keeps for a short period of time, but are not maintained for any length of time. Assistant City Attorney Redlein noted that if something comes in the mail that is used or needs to be kept it is a public record, but if it not used then it should not be kept. Maybe the word “and” needs to be emphasized so that nobody else makes the same mistake. Mr. Marcella indicated that because the word “received” is specifically broad gives parameters and is specific enough. Deputy City Manager Selby pointed out that the words “revised definition” need to be stricken.

Chair Ronemus suggested that in order to keep the language consistent, instead of using individual or multiple departments use routine or multi-departments in the “Extraordinary Requests” paragraph. Assistant City Attorney Redlein replied that the change converts the routine requests into something else. Deputy City Manager asked that the second sentence under the same paragraph be deleted.

Mr. Goecke outlined an example of a request that might come through his department dealing with a traffic accident report that occurred on this date a year ago. It would take a tremendous amount of time to obtain that information because accidents are not filed by date, but by intersection. In that instance every “single” intersection would have to be looked at to see if there was an accident on December 21 of 2000. Mr. Marcella added that in that case on page 2 under “Multi-Departmental Request” the word single should be deleted and the entire sentence should read “Multi-Departmental Request” is a public record that requires production of records from multiple departments. Chair Ronemus suggested that the second sentence under “Extraordinary Requests” be deleted. Mr. Marcella also requested that for consistency in “Extraordinary Requests” the words “a public record request which” should be added to the paragraph.

**MEETING RECESSED FROM 1:45 P.M. TO 1:50 P.M.**

Ms. Kuhns asked whether definitions on page 3 after “standard page” would be provided. Mr. Goecke pointed out that those definitions have already been defined in Chapter 1. Therefore, it was agreed that the definitions not be repeated.

Ms. Kuhns and Chair Ronemus both agreed that on page 6, Routine Public Record Requests, the second bullet is questionable. This is referencing a departmental price list. Ms. Kuhns asked whether the verbiage in italics is what the committee wants stated. Chair Ronemus indicated that her understanding was that labor costs would be left to the departments to figure out based on the individual they were having do the work. She does not believe the Records Committee would be approving the fees. Mr. Marcella suggested that “price list” be changed to “fee schedule” and to

delete the last part of the sentence "and approved by the Records Management Committee". The committee concurred.

Chair Ronemus discussed with Mr. Riggleman the Media requests section. Mr. Riggleman proposed and submitted for the record the following changes on page 6: "The Office of Communications will be notified when requests to inspect or obtain copies of records are received from members of the media, and will help coordinate requests involving multiple Departments. This can include compilation of the records, collection of necessary fees, and delivery of the documents". Mr. Riggleman indicated that the same language could be used for the routine, multi-departmental and extraordinary requests.

Chair Ronemus indicated a housekeeping item under Departmental Responsibilities that the word "with" be included between Office and the time. She discussed with Mr. Marcella the reason why he deleted the last paragraph on page 9 regarding Enterprise Fund Division. Mr. Marcella replied that many people do not have the mechanism to do that. However, Mr. Goecke suggested that it would not hurt to leave the paragraph. Upon discussion whether the word "will" should be replaced with the word "may", Ms. Kuhns explained that the Enterprise Fund division wants the records to be picked up at their place of business.

Chair Ronemus asked whether any changes needed to be made under Fees, General Information. The committee discussed the Alternate Fee Schedule deviating from the Resolution. Mr. Marcella indicated that a particular department might deviate from the fee schedule for providing certain specialized documents or labor costs, which are not included in the fee schedule. Chair Ronemus pointed out that the committee already determined that it would not be setting fees for CDs and dollars amounts. Her concern is that the committee is leaving this to the discretion of the departments. This might lead to the violation of the Resolution.

Assistant City Attorney Redlein suggested caption of Alternate Fee be replaced with Other Costs. Ms. Kuhns pointed out that the Resolution specifically states the paper sizes and the \$1.00 a page fee. She indicated that the Purchasing Department produces the same paper size, but charges less. Therefore, they would have to come before the committee for departure from the standard copying fee. Deputy City Manager Selby asked whether bidding documents are public record requests. The bid packages are produced to solicit bids. After the bidding period, those documents become public records. Chair Ronemus was concerned about the committee having told the Purchasing Department that their bid packages are now a quarter a page, regardless if it is a year later. Mr. Goecke stated that this should be undone. Deputy City Manager Selby indicated that those departments producing documents other than a public record request, as part of the City's business, such as Purchasing and Leisure Services Departments, should have the discretion regarding the cost of producing documents. Assistant City Attorney Redlein suggested that the paragraph be amended to state: "Materials produced in advance for the promotion of City activities may be available for reduced fees." Therefore, it was agreed by the committee that the Purchasing Department could charge a quarter a page for current big packages and \$1.00 a page for anything after the bid process time frame.

Chair Ronemus reiterated that on page 10 Other Costs would replace the caption "Alternate Fee" and that the first paragraph would be modified as stated.

Mr. Marcella suggested that the first paragraph on page 11 be eliminated and include the Resolution into the last paragraph on page 10. However, Deputy City Manager Selby indicated that this section should not be eliminated because, by law a department is supposed to post if they are going to charge anything else that is not in the fee schedule. The section states that it is prudent for a department to come to the Records Management Committee and consult with them if there is a departure from the standard copying and certification fees. It does not say that the committee will approve the fees. He believes that the committee should not approve things that are not technically public records requests. Chair Ronemus concurred, adding that the committee should be approving those things that are public records request. Deputy City Manager Selby suggested that reference should be made about the role of the Records Management Committee, since the Resolution references the committee. Chair Ronemus suggested that reference about the authority of the Records Management Committee on deviation from standard copying costs should be included in the last paragraph on page 10. Deputy City Manager Selby proposed to paraphrase what is stated in the Resolution and leave that as a section under the heading "Records Management Committee" and include the following paragraph: "In accordance with Resolution No. R-103-2001, the City has established a Records Management Committee which has the authority to consider and set departures from standard copying and/or certification fees, and shall offer its services on a consultation basis for all other charges."

Assistant City Attorney Redlein pointed out that in the last paragraph on page 10 the "s" in the word "materials" should be deleted. Additionally, he suggested that the requestor would be responsible for the "additional" expenses. Chair Ronemus verified that this paragraph would follow with the heading and paragraph regarding the Resolution as stated by Deputy City Manager Selby.

In order to remain consistent, on page 11 "Price Lists" was changed to Departmental "Fee Schedule" for Alternate Medium. Mr. Goecke suggested that the entire paragraph be moved under the heading "Other Costs". Chair Ronemus outlined the sequence of paragraphs on page 10: "General Information", "Records Management Committee" with Deputy City Manager Selby's comments, "Other Costs", and then a listing for "Departmental Fee Schedule for Alternate Medium".

On page 12, Assistant City Attorney Redlein recommended that the first paragraph should state: "A generic public records request form (Attachment A) is provided to assist the departments. Departments may expand this form as needed but the form should contain no less information than the generic form. For those departments receiving requests for copyrighted materials, a warning may be added to their Public Records Request Form that the use of copyrighted materials for any other purpose other than "criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship or research" may constitute copyright infringement (17 U.S.C.A. Sec. 107). See page 4 for explanation."

**MARCELLA - Motion to APPROVE the Public Records Access Overview Policy Introduction Procedure as amended SELBY seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS with VINCENT and SNELDING excused**

Mr. Goecke asked how long a contract is current and suggested that Mr. Vincent provide a better definition for current. Ms. Kuhns indicated that according to the list of OPR documents, " bids

are documents, the information gathering process, technical specification, the purchase process for supplies equipment and services. The file may include request for quotation, the informal request for prices, usually three or less vendors in items less than \$25,000, request for proposals, invitations to bid on all items costing more than \$25,000, the list of vendors, the valuation, the responses, the correspondence and related documents.” They are maintained in Finance for six years.

Chair Ronemus suggested that Chapter 1 be revisited and completed, because there seems to be an issue for a lot of people regarding the Office of Primary Responsibility about who has the primary responsibility of maintaining records.

(1:35 – 1:49)

**1-33**

**C. INFORMATIONAL MATTERS FOR FUTURE RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDAS.**

Chair Ronemus asked that the committee think about the possibility for a records center. Due to budgetary constraints, the center cannot be put through the Clerk’s Office. However, there might be some grant monies available. She asked that the committee give some thought on the importance or non-importance of this issue. Since the City is trying to acquire the post office from the GSA, Ms. Kuhns indicated that there is a possibility of using one of the four floors. There might be a way of writing some kind of grant to incorporate archiving historical documents. She asked if the Records Management Committee would want to lend their support. She asked direction on whether to put in a CPI for this issue in the next budget cycle.

(1:49 – 2:53)

**1 – 2763**

**CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:**

None.

**ADJOURNED:**

**GOECKE - Motion to ADJOURN – SELBY - seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS with VINCENT and SNELDING excused**

The meeting adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

/ac